## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT - Development Review Services



Richard J. Berry, Mayor

November 3, 2014

David Soule, P.E. Rio Grande Engineering P.O. Box 93924 Albuquerque, NM 87199

**RE:** Estates at Glendale Unit 2

Drainage Report and Grading and Drainage Plan Engineer's Stamp Date 10-13-14 (File: B19D027)

Dear Mr. Soule:

Based upon the information provided in your submittal received 10-13-14, the above referenced submittal cannot be approved for action by the DRB on the Site Plan for Building Permit or the Preliminary Plat; or for Grading Permit until the following comments are addressed.

- 1. Concrete channel in SW corner needs to be shown on plan and PDE on plat.
- 2. Existing contours are barely visible

PO Box 1293

3. Land treatments of offsite basins use 43% Treatment A, which is for undisturbed by human activity. Aerial views show that these lots are graded and landscaped and I believe should be more along the lines of treatments used in the NAADR, or 20% A, 20%B, 34% C, and 26%D, resulting in a total runoff similar to that in the Drainage Report by Mark Goodwin and Assoc.

Albuquerque

4. Approvals from owners are required prior to providing openings in existing block walls.

New Mexico 87103 5.

5. The amount of offsite flows from the south thru each lot needs to be quantified, the location of each opening, and flow arrows indicating how the drainage passes thru each lot.

www.cabq.gov

- 6. Offsite basin 104 from the Mark Goodwin Drainage Report drains thru a concrete channel in SW corner.
- 7. A drainage easement on east side of Lot 11 should allow offsite flows from Basin G to drain to North Star lane.
- 8. How is first flush handled? Drainage report indicates Storm Tech SC-740 Chambers, but are not shown on plan. First flush is captured by the "Isolator Row", which requires a woven fabric and inlet structure (manhole or Nyloplast drain basin) for clean out. Since this is a relatively new method of handling the First Flush, we should think about whether an inlet structure needs to be there and where it would be located on the site plan.
- 9. Scaling of areas shows land treatment D is about 58%, rather than 38% of total area for onsite basins.
- 10. Lots along west boundary should drain east to road, per the Mark Goodwin Drainage plan.

- 11. Street capacity and pipe calculations should be revised per the above comment and also to reflect greater flows from the revised land treatments.
- 12. The total runoff from this site and the offsite flows from the Mark Goowin report is 23.84 cfs. If the two inlets pick up 16.5 cfs, there is 7.3 cfs bypassing. Show street capacity calculations of Glendale to handle this additional flow. Show that downstream inlets have capacity.
- 13. Lot 14 does not have enough frontage for a drivepad on south side of inlet.

If you have any questions, you can contact me at 924-3695.

Sincerely,

Rita Harmon, P.E.

Senior Engineer, Planning Dept. Development Review Services

Orig: Drainage file

c.pdf: via Email: Recipient